



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services

Building Codes Division

1535 Edgewater Street NW

PO Box 14470

Salem, OR 97309-0404

(503) 378-4133

FAX (503) 378-2322

bcd.oregon.gov

September 14, 2009

## *Oregon Structural Specialty Code Committee*

*Thursday, July 9, 2009*

### **Meeting Summary**

**\*\*NOTE:** *The following is a summary of the committee's discussion.*

*To review the meeting in its entirety, the archived video of the meeting is available on the committee's Web site at the following link: <http://www.bcd.oregon.gov/committees/10osscc.html>*

**Members Present:** *(Vice-chair)* Gary Lampella, Oregon Building Officials Association (OBOA)  
Andy Dykeman, Lease Crutcher Lewis  
George McCart, Oregon Disabilities Commission  
Eric McMullen, Fire Marshal  
Jim Rimenschneider, Structural Engineers Association of Oregon (SEAO)  
Jim Kitchin, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) for Susan Steward (BOMA)

**Members Absent:** *(Chair)* Terrence Dieter, Intel  
John Rakowitz, Associated General Contractors (AGC)

**Guests Present:** Ray Miller, SEAO Code Committee  
Anthony Barsotti, OR-OSHA Construction Advisory Committee (CAC)  
Dave Kaiser, CAC  
Tom Young, Northwest Concrete and Masonry Association (NWCMA)  
James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness  
Johnathan Balkema, Oregon Home Builders Association (OHBA)

**Staff Present:** Richard Rogers, Structural Program Chief  
Shane Sumption, Fire and Life Safety Code Specialist  
Jim Hanson, Policy Analyst  
Shauna Parker, Rules Coordinator  
Dana Fischer, Building Code Para-Technical

*Vice-chair Lampella called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m.*

### **Review public code change proposals**

#### [Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-04](#)

Anthony Barsotti, OR-OSHA's Construction Advisory Committee (CAC), reviewed the revised draft of the code amendment proposal. He noted who worked on the proposed changes and provided an updated list of supporters.

Jim Kitchin stated that the building owners appreciate the efforts going into this, but are concerned about the impact to the contractors. He asked about the threshold triggers for the requirement as well as how the financial impacts are mitigated.

Vice-chair Lampella stated he also has some questions and concerns with the proposal. He discussed the scope of the provisions, noting that as the proposal is currently written, the requirement applies to every building built under the OSSC. He noted his concern about exempt structures and how the code provisions apply. Vice-chair Lampella stated he believes the projected cost will likely be higher than noted in the proposal. He then asked for more information on the Z359.6 standard.

Mr. Barsotti explained that the ANSI Z359.6, *Specification and design requirement for active fall protection systems*, requirement provides the engineer design criteria for fall protection systems. Specifically, the .6 version addresses the designs for the fall criteria for anchorages. He noted that all of ANSI Z359 addresses fall protection requirements.

Andy Dykeman asked whether some of the systems are pre-engineered and, if so, how those would meet the code requirements in the proposal.

Mr. Barsotti stated that some of the systems are indeed pre-engineered. He described how manufacturers accommodating these systems, noting the inspection steps required by the proposal can be included at the manufacturing phase.

Richard Rogers, structural program chief, asked about the intent of the section referencing the ANSI Z standard and pre-engineering situations. He stated he feels there is a valid concern regarding the engineering requirements, because with this code change those buildings that normally do not require an engineer will now be required to have one. He suggested some language to differentiate between the proposed manufacturer and engineering requirements by changing the provision to read: “designed and installed in accordance with the manufacturer’s listing or ANSI Z359....”

Mr. Barsotti explained the group tried to modify the proposal to allow the building official to have options on how to handle various situations. He stated that the intent of the proposal is to use the engineering services provided by the manufacturer and not add other engineering requirements.

Vice-chair Lampella stressed that the contractor is going to have to prove to the building official that the project is valid and meets the engineering requirements because there is no device for the building official to measure the project to ensure it meets the code requirements. He stated that is a big concern.

Mr. Barsotti described the existing OSHA requirements for roof anchoring and explained there are design models available for engineers to use when analyzing and designing the structure, allowing the engineer to easily meet both the OSHA requirements and the requirements of the proposal.

Mr. Dykeman noted that OSHA already requires the installation of roof anchors or some sort of fall protection system at the time of construction. Because of that, the costs of such systems are already included in the overall costs for many projects because at least a temporary system has to be used. He stated this just makes the fall protection system permanent.

Mr. Kitchin noted that the proposal is requiring the fall protection system to be a part of the permanent structure, but maintenance is not covered or addressed. He asked for clarification on what triggers the installation of the system and whether it is at the time of repair or retrofit.

Mr. Barsotti explained the trigger would align with existing trigger requirements; this means that modifications to the structure that require bringing the building up to current code would trigger this provision. He clarified that simple repairs to roofs would not trigger the requirement.

The committee discussed how the term “walking surfaces” relates to the definition of a roof. They brainstormed the meaning of a walking surface in the capacity of the proposed requirements. They then discussed their concerns about adding walking surfaces to the definition of a roof and suggested language to address the concern. The committee also reviewed the requirements and definitions included in Chapter 10 for roofs and guards. They agreed there is a discrepancy between the terms “walking surface” and “roof” that need to be addressed.

Mr. Barsotti explained the intent was to use the definition of guards in chapter 10 rather than using roofs or another section of the code to define a walking surface. He further explained that the OSHA code uses “guardrails” interchangeably with walking surfaces when addressing design systems.

Vice-chair Lampella cautioned about trying to write code during the meeting to address the concerns. He went on to explain his concerns with the proposal. He noted his concern with Table 1501.2, which uses anchor spacing examples, explaining that in the structural code, tables are not used as examples and the content in them are specific code requirements. Vice-chair Lampella also noted his concern with Section 1501.2.3, which includes an additional step in the process by adding a requirement for the stamping of engineering and construction documents. He also stated that there are several places in the proposal that are not typical code language, making it hard to understand and interpret the proposed requirements. He affirmed that he is very sympathetic to the issue, but thinks the proposal still needs some work and should address a threshold or scoping requirement.

Mr. Barsotti offered to work with BCD staff and interested parties to address the committee’s concerns. He stated they would like to see the requirements included in the 2010 OSSC.

James Bela, Oregon Earthquake Awareness, stated he is in favor of anchorage protection, but he does not understand the 5,000 pound requirement and feels it is not realistic. He explained the life-cycle cost needs to be taken into consideration. He also suggested simplifying the language on the second page of the amended proposal and including a section for scope. Mr. Bela noted that the issue of maintenance is important.

**Motion** to **TABLE** code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-04 until the next meeting to allow the proponent to work with interested parties in an effort to address the committee’s concerns.  
*Motion carried unanimously.*

#### [Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-23](#)

Tom Young, Northwest Concrete Masonry Association (NWCMA), explained the proposal to amend **Section 1405.6.2 (Seismic requirements)** relating to masonry and brick veneer. He noted there is a current state amendment for this section. He explained the proposal updates section references and clarifies the language in the existing Oregon amendment to align with changes to the new model code. The requirements for seismic occupancy categories 3 and 4 included in the existing Oregon amendment would remain without change.

The committee briefly discussed the seismic categories included in this code requirement.

Ray Miller, structural engineer, explained why the requirement was changed to specifically include seismic categories 3 and 4 during the last cycle. He noted that the provision is designed to cover essential facilities. He went on to explain that new research from a University of California, San Diego study agrees with this change.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-23.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

#### [Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-24](#)

Tom Young, NWCMA, described the proposal relating to **Section 2104.1 (Masonry construction)**. He explained the purpose of the proposal is to ease standards in masonry construction. The proposal simply would increase the requirement from 5' to 5'4" to align with typical masonry standards. Mr. Young stated this language has already gone through the committee process and been approved for inclusion in the 2011 national masonry code.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-24.

#### *Discussion on the motion:*

Vice-chair Lampella pointed out the different numbering that uses specific numbers from the national standard. He asked if the numbering can be aligned with typical code formatting.

Chief Rogers stated, since those numbers are legally part of the standard, staff will look into how to make the numbering consistent in the code. He said the numbering will likely be similar to Chapter 16 where the ASCE 7 standard is modified.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

#### [Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-25](#)

Tom Young, NWCMA, described the new amendment proposal for **Section 2107.2 (Load combinations)**. He explained that traditionally with masonry, short term loads are allowed to increase the stress by one-third. The point of the amendment is to clarify the requirements and application of this section in order to address existing problems with the interpretation of these provisions. Mr. Young noted the State of Washington's building department approved this proposal.

Mr. Bela stated his concern about increasing the seismic loading stress with such a brittle material, noting there should be clarification whether the provision applies to seismic or non-seismic loads.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-25.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

#### [Code Amendment Proposals #OSSC 10-26 & #OSSC 10-27](#)

Tom Young, NWCMA, described the proposals that address anchor bolt requirements in two code sections, Section 2107.3 and Section 2108.2. He explained the proposal updates a current statewide amendment and includes language that will be included in the 2011 national model code for masonry (MSJC) which provides more specific requirements for anchor bolting. He noted the proposal does not change the way in which anchor bolts are installed.

Mr. Bela asserted that for the record, the committee should require the documentation proving a code change has actually been included in the new national standard.

Mr. Young elaborated on the process for the committee and clarified the considerations used in developing the requirements.

Vice-chair Lampella agreed with Mr. Bela's request to provide the standard for the record, and asked Mr. Young to provide a copy to the committee.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposals #OSSC 10-26 and #OSSC 10-27.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Mr. Young also noted that the existing Oregon amendment for Section 2106.1 can now be removed because it is included in the national code.

***Break.***

#### [Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-10](#)

Ray Miller, structural engineer representing SEAO, discussed the proposal relating to Section 2305.4 and addressing dissimilar materials in wind loading. He explained much of the proposal is an existing Oregon amendment, but the coefficients were updated to match the new national standard and the exception was removed.

Shane Sumption, fire and life safety code specialist, clarified the proposal, confirming that the existing Oregon amendment will be maintained and the new language presented in the proposal will be added.

Mr. Bela stated his confusion over the language in the proposal dealing with dissimilar materials on the "same side." He explained he was concerned about stacked components and seismic safety.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-10.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

#### [Code Amendment Proposals #OSSC 10-11, #OSSC 10-12, and #OSSC 10-13](#)

Ray Miller, structural engineer representing SEAO, reviewed the three code amendment proposals that deal with penthouse requirements in **Section 1613.7 (Modifications to ASCE 7 – 05)**. He explained code proposal #OSSC 10-11 addresses a BCD interpretive ruling and clarifies an existing Oregon amendment to the code. He explained the proposal updates the code to align with the interpretation.

Mr. Bela noted his concern about the weight change in item B by 4 times. He also noted his concern that seismic design category C was not included in the requirement.

Mr. Miller went on to discuss the remaining changes to the proposals, explaining that a lot of the changes came from the ASCE 7 Errata or are clarifications to language in existing Oregon amendments.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposals #OSSC 10-11, #OSSC 10-12, and #OSSC 10-13.

***Discussion on the motion...***

Mr. Bela stated that he feels it is a mistake to wordsmith penthouse into all the ASCE 7 requirements, noting that he believes there will be unintended consequences.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

[Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-14](#)  
[and Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-16](#)

Ray Miller, structural engineer representing SEAO, reviewed the two code amendment proposals that deal with the snow load charts in Sections 1608.2 and 1608.1. He explained that new data has been released relating to snow load minimums. He explained that the use of these new snow load charts was adopted through an alternate method, and these proposals simply adjust the requirements to line up with the new data and includes them in the code.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposals #OSSC 10-14 and #OSSC 10-16.  
*Motion carried unanimously.*

[Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-15](#)

Ray Miller, structural engineer representing SEAO, explained the proposal relating to Table 1607.1, which tries to address some recent questions about the design criteria for a foot bridge. He explained the numbers in the table comes from the AASHTO design standards used by the highway department.

The committee discussed the requirements for a vehicle accessible foot bridge in the proposal. They talked about other sections that may cover similar requirements, such as those provisions for walkways and elevated platforms. The committee also discussed the definition of a foot bridge. They noted that regulating foot bridges may be outside the scope of the building code.

Chief Rogers explained that typically if it is not part of the accessible route or the means of egress then it is outside the jurisdiction of the division. He stated that staff will follow up with the policy section at the division to determine whether foot bridges are outside the scope of the statutory authority of the building code.

*The committee agreed to **TABLE** code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-15.*

[Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-17](#)

Ray Miller, structural engineer representing SEAO, explained the proposal relating to Table 1607.1 and the uniform psf requirement for residential habitable attics and sleeping areas.

The committee questioned whether the Oregon residential code was changed to align with the structural model code requirement of 30 psf. The committee agreed that the requirement should be consistent among the codes.

*The committee agreed to address this proposal after the lunch break to allow staff to research the residential code requirements.*

***Lunch break.***

[Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-17 continued](#)

The committee discussed the sleeping area provisions in the residential code and agreed the terms should be consistent across the codes.

*The proponent **withdrew** the proposal.*

[Revisited Code Amendment Proposal #OSSC 10-15](#)

Chief Rogers followed up on the discussion surrounding bridges, confirming that if the bridge is not part of the structure or the means of egress on a structure then it is not regulated by the state building

code. He further clarified that there could be a footbridge at the means of egress that could be addressed in the code, if there are recurring issues there.

Mr. Miller noted that if the committee felt uncomfortable addressing foot bridges in the structural code, the proponent would be happy to withdraw it.

The committee debated whether a clarification to address foot bridges at an egress pathway was needed in the building code. They brainstormed ways to address the issue and considered what the foot bridge requirements should be. They discussed the psf requirements of similar provisions in the code, including whether to keep the AASHTO standard's psf requirement or align it with the psf requirements in the corridor provisions.

Mr. Bela stated his support for including foot bridges in the building code and encouraged the committee to incorporate these provisions.

The committee agreed to remove the provisions for a vehicle accessible foot bridge. They also agreed to modify the foot bridge requirements to read "exterior foot bridge (when part of the means of egress or an accessible route)"; and that the uniform psf requirement should align with the AASHTO standard.

**Motion** to approve code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-15 as amended by the committee.  
*Motion carried unanimously.*

*Eric McMullen left at 1:10 p.m.*

**Continue review of Existing Oregon amendments, beginning with Chapter 5  
CHAPTER 5, GENERAL BUILDING HEIGHTS AND AREAS  
SECTION 508, MIXED USE AND OCCUPANCY**

**508.2 Incidental uses**

Vice-chair Lampella discussed sprinklering requirements in incidental use occupancies and described the differences between mixed used and incidental use occupancies.

The committee agreed to go with the model code language in this section and delete the existing Oregon amendment for incidental uses in Section 508.2.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA07-05, with the exception of Section 508.2 where model code language will be used and the Oregon amendment deleted.  
*Motion carried unanimously.*

**CHAPTER 9, FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS**

Mr. Sumption summarized the model code changes and explained how they relate to the existing Oregon amendments for Chapter 9.

**SECTION 901, GENERAL**

**901.1 Scope**

Mr. Sumption noted that the existing Oregon amendment for this section references the fire code.

## **SECTION 903, AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEMS**

### **903.1.1 Alternative protection**

Mr. Sumption pointed out that, where appropriate, the authority having jurisdiction is changed from “fire code official” to “building official” throughout the code.

### **903.2.7 Group R**

Mr. Sumption noted that the existing Oregon amendment for this section references the fire code.

#### **903.2.7.1 Requirements**

Mr. Sumption explained this section deals with substantial alteration or damage to existing non-sprinkled apartments and should be brought forward to this code cycle.

### **903.2.9 Group S-2**

Mr. Sumption explained that because model code now addresses the requirements, the existing Oregon amendment for this section is no longer needed and can be deleted.

#### **903.2.10 Group S-2 enclosed parking garages**

Mr. Sumption explained that model code now mirrors the existing Oregon amendment for the code section, by adding a threshold and a trigger. He noted this change eliminates the need for the Oregon amendment, so it can be deleted.

##### **903.2.10.4 Piers or wharves**

Mr. Sumption explained piers and wharves are added to the Oregon code, noting that this section is Oregon specific and the amendment should be brought forward to this code cycle.

#### **903.3.1.1.1 Exempt locations**

Mr. Sumption noted that the references to the fire code official in this section were changed to building official.

#### **903.4.1 Signals**

Mr. Sumption noted that the references to the fire code official in this section were changed to building official.

## **SECTION 904, ALTERNATIVE AUTOMATIC FIRE-EXTINGUISHING SYSTEMS**

### **904.2 Where required**

Mr. Sumption noted that the references to the fire code official in this section were changed to building official.

## **SECTION 905, STANDPIPE SYSTEMS**

### **905.5.1.1 Group A occupancies with and occupant load exceeding 1,000**

Mr. Sumption explained that the Oregon amendment was not captured in model code and is still needed.

### **905.5.1.2 Groups I, H, B, S, M, F, Division 1 occupancies less than four stories in height but greater than 20,000 square feet per floor**

Mr. Sumption explained that the Oregon amendment was not captured in model code and is still needed.

### **905.5.3 Class II system 1-inch hose**

Mr. Sumption noted that the references to the fire code official in this section were changed to building official.

## **SECTION 907, FIRE ALARM AND DETECTION SYSTEMS**

### **907.2.6 Group I**

Mr. Sumption noted the requirements in this section are Oregon specific, so the existing Oregon amendment should be brought forward.

#### **907.2.6.2 Group I-2**

Mr. Sumption explained that while model code language has changed, it still does not completely capture the provisions contained in the existing Oregon amendment. He said that because of that fact, the committee may want to carry the existing Oregon amendment forward.

##### **907.2.6.2.1 Annunciation**

Mr. Sumption explained the requirements in this section are Oregon specific, so the existing Oregon amendment should be brought forward.

#### **907.9.1.3 Groups I-1, R-1 and R-4**

Mr. Sumption noted that the Oregon amendment for this section reference Oregon's Chapter 11 and NFPA standards. He noted that the Oregon amendment is still needed.

#### **907.9.1.4 Group R-2**

Mr. Sumption described the Oregon specific requirements in this section relate to visual alarms and clarifies they can be used in public areas not individual dwelling units, aligning the requirement to FHA standards. He noted that the Oregon amendment is still needed.

##### **Table 907.9.1.3 Visible and audible alarms**

Mr. Sumption explained that historically this table is deleted because of the accessibility provisions and how they relate to the requirements in Oregon's Chapter 11. He recommended deleting the table and carrying the amendment forward to this code cycle.

Mr. Sumption noted that the remaining items in existing Oregon amendment for Chapter 9 are simply reference changes from the "fire code official" to "building official."

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-09 where the model code does not capture the changes.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 10, MEANS OF EGRESS**

### **SECTION 1003, GENERAL MEANS OF EGRESS**

#### **1003.2 Ceiling height**

Mr. Sumption explained the existing Oregon amendment for this section was a substantial code change last cycle and has not been addressed in model code. He noted that the Oregon amendment is still needed.

### **1003.3.4 Clear width**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code Chapter 11 to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions are not adopted.

### **1003.7 Elevators, escalators and moving walks**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions for Section 1007 are not adopted.

## **SECTION 1007, ACCESSIBLE MEANS OF EGRESS**

Mr. Sumption explained that model code Section 1007 is not adopted by the state of Oregon because accessibility requirements are captured in Oregon's Chapter 11.

## **SECTION 1008, DOORS, GATES AND TURNSTILES**

### **1008.1.1 Size of doors**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section adds a reference to requirements in Oregon's Chapter 11.

### **1008.1.2 Door swing**

Mr. Sumption explained that while there were some model code changes to this section, they do not capture Oregon amendment relating to health care facilities. He noted that the Oregon amendment is still needed.

Mr. McCart pointed out a conflict in psf requirements between the requirements listed in Oregon's Chapter 11 and the provisions in the existing Oregon amendment for Section 1008.1.8.6.1.

Chief Rogers clarified that if the door is part of an accessible route, Chapter 11 would trump this requirement because it is more restrictive. He also noted that the model code change to item 9 of this section which allows for a manually operated horizontally sliding doors and may capture the intent of the Oregon amendment, so the amendment may not be needed.

*The committee agreed to **TABLE** this section to allow follow up on model code changes to see if the Oregon amendment is captured.*

### **1008.1.8.6.1 Controlled egress locks**

Mr. Sumption noted that this section is Oregon specific and the committee will likely want to retain the requirements.

### **1008.3 Turnstiles**

Mr. Sumption explained the Oregon amendment add gates to the requirement and includes a reference to Oregon's Chapter 11 provisions.

## **SECTION 1009, STAIRWAYS**

### **1009.1 Stairway width**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions for Section 1007 are not adopted.

### **1009.3.3 Profile**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions for Section 1007 are not adopted.

### **1009.11 Stairway to roof**

Mr. Sumption explained the requirements in this section were not captured by model code and are still needed.

#### **1009.11.1 Roof access**

Mr. Sumption noted the model code measurement for roof access is modified in the existing Oregon amendment.

The committee discussed this provision, noting that the 30 inch wide by 8 foot long requirement in the existing Oregon code seemed excessive when the model code requirement is essentially 2 foot by 4 foot. They talked about the impacts to the roof structure and the product availability of such a large door.

*The committee agreed to **TABLE** this and readdress it at a future meeting.*

## **SECTION 1010, RAMPS**

### **1010.1 Scope**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code Chapter 11 to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions are not adopted.

### **1010.6.5 Doorways**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section adds a reference to requirements in Oregon's Chapter 11.

### **1010.9 Edge protection**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section adds a reference to requirements in Oregon's Chapter 11.

## **SECTION 1011, EXIT SIGNS**

### **1011.3 Tactile exit signs**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section adds a reference to requirements in Oregon's Chapter 11.

## **SECTION 1019, EGRESS BALCONIES**

### **1019.1.3 Multistory dwelling units**

Mr. Sumption explained that the requirements in this section were adopted early as a mid-cycle amendment and some of the requirements are now covered in the national model code. He explained that some of the Oregon amendment can now be deleted.

Mr. McCart pointed out that the exceptions covered in the Oregon amendment are not captured in the model code changes and need to be kept.

The committee agreed the exceptions need to be retained as an Oregon amendment.

### **1019.2 Stories with one exit**

Mr. Sumption explained that the requirements in this section were adopted as an Oregon mid-cycle amendment and are now covered in the national model code. He explained that the Oregon amendment can now be deleted.

### **Table 1019.2 Stories with one exit**

Mr. Sumption explained that the requirements in this section were adopted as an Oregon mid-cycle amendment and are now covered in the national model code. He explained that the Oregon amendment can now be deleted.

## **SECTION 1025, HORIZONTAL EXITS**

### **1025.5.1 Enclosure of balcony openings**

Mr. Sumption noted that the amendment to this section changes the reference from model code to the appropriate section in Oregon's Chapter 11 since the model code provisions for Section 1007 are not adopted.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-10 where the model code does not capture the changes, with the exception of Sections 1008.1.2 and 1009.11.1 which shall be tabled.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 11, ACCESSIBILITY**

Mr. McCart summarized Chapter 11, explaining that, for now, the existing Oregon amendment to Chapter 11 will be carried forward until the national standards are finalized. Once the new ADAAG standards are approved, each state is required by law to adopt its provisions immediately, on an emergency code change basis.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-11.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 12, INTERIOR ENVIRONMENT**

### **SECTION 1203, VENTILATION**

#### **1203.3.2 Exceptions**

Mr. Sumption explained the requirements in this section include a reference to Oregon's Chapter 13.

### **SECTION 1208, INTERIOR SPACE DIMENSIONS**

#### **1208.2 Minimum ceiling heights**

Mr. Sumption noted this amendment coordinates and aligns with the existing Oregon amendment in Chapter 10.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-12.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 14, EXTERIOR WALLS**

### **SECTION 1402, DEFINITIONS**

Mr. Sumption noted that Oregon adds additional items to the definition of anchored masonry veneer.

### **SECTION 1403, PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS**

#### **1403.2 Weather protection**

Mr. Sumption explained the requirements in this section include a reference to Oregon's Chapter 13.

## **SECTION 1405, INSTALLATION OF WALL COVERINGS**

### **1405.5.2 Seismic requirements**

Mr. Sumption noted that portions of this Oregon amendment have been captured in model code, but some items were not addressed and therefore, the amendment is still needed.

### **1405.9.1 Interior adhered masonry veneers**

Mr. Sumption noted that the Oregon amendment adds an exception that is not captured in model code.

### **1405.10.4 Grounding**

Mr. Sumption noted the Oregon amendment in this section simply correlates the requirements to the Oregon Electrical Specialty Code (OESC).

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-14.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 15, ROOF ASSEMBLIES AND ROOFTOP STRUCTURES**

### **SECTION 1503, WEATHER PROTECTION**

#### **1503.4 Roof ventilation**

Mr. Sumption noted that the requirements in this section were captured in Oregon as a mid-cycle amendment, replacing model code provisions with a new section containing the requirements for roof drainage.

Chief Rogers explained that there were some additions to Section 1503.4 regarding roof drainage in the new 2009 model code, but the requirements are different than those contained in the Oregon amendment.

The committee agreed the requirements in the Oregon amendment were important and should be brought forward by replacing model code Section 1503.4.

**Motion** to replace model code 1503.4 with the existing Oregon amendment language for section 1504.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

### **SECTION 1504, ROOF DRAINAGE**

*See the committee's discussion on this section above under the discussion for Section 1503.4.*

## **SECTION 1511, REROOFING**

### **1511.3.1 Reroofing inspection**

Mr. Sumption noted this Oregon amendment is specific to Oregon and should be kept.

### **1511.3.2 Final inspection**

Mr. Sumption noted this Oregon amendment is still needed and will be renumbered accordingly to line up with the new model code.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-15.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 16, STRUCTURAL DESIGN**

Mr. Sumption asked committee member Jim Riemenschneider, representing SEAO, to review the Chapter 16 provisions of the existing Oregon amendments with the committee.

## **SECTION 1603, CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS**

### **1603.1.3 Roof snow load**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that the Oregon amendment for this section is still needed, but the committee approved a code proposal that will update the snow load provisions to the new testing requirements. This newly approved proposal will replace the current Oregon amendment.

### **1603.1.4 Wind design data**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that the Oregon amendment for this section refers to the 1998 OSSC and is still needed, but the committee approved a code proposal that will update provisions to include new testing requirements. This newly approved proposal will replace the current Oregon amendment.

## **SECTION 1604, GENERAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS**

### **Table 1604.5, Occupancy Category of Buildings and Other Structures**

Mr. Riemenschneider recommended removing this existing Oregon amendment and retaining model code language for this table.

Chief Rogers explained the reasons behind “or” being changed to “and” in Oregon, noting that it was partially done to remain consistent with statutory requirements.

Mr. Sumption pointed out that in previous editions of the code, the language had been more specific and all encompassing by using the terms “hospitals and other health care facilities,” whereas the current model code is more general and states “group I-2 occupancies.”

The committee agreed to delete the existing Oregon amendment for this table and go with model code.

## **SECTION 1607, LIVE LOADS**

### **Table 1607.1, Minimum Uniformly Distributed Live Loads and Minimum Concentrated Live Loads**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that footnote j is still needed and should be retained.

## **SECTION 1608, SNOW LOADS**

### **1608.1 General**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **1608.2 Ground snowloads**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

## **SECTION 1609, WIND LOADS**

### **1609.1.1 Determination of wind loads**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that the new model code provisions sufficiently address these requirements and the existing Oregon amendment can be deleted.

### **1609.1.1.2 Applicability of 1998 OSSC provisions**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that the new model code provisions sufficiently address these requirements and the existing Oregon amendment can be deleted.

### **1609.3 Basic wind speed**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that the new model code provisions sufficiently address these requirements and the existing Oregon amendment can be deleted.

### **Figure 1609 – Basic Wind Speeds (3-second gust) in Miles Per Hour (X 1.61 for km/h)**

Mr. Riemenschneider clarified that the Oregon wind map for this section should be retained. He noted the figure needs to be updated to reflect the change in the formula for calculating wind speed totals. He said the wind speeds should read 85, 95, and 105, respectively.

*The committee agreed TABLE this section in order to check with SEAO and clarify the wind speed numbers.*

## **SECTION 1612, FLOOD LOADS**

### **1612.1 General**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

## **SECTION 1613, EARTHQUAKE LOADS**

### **1613.1 Scope**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **1613.5.1 Mapped acceleration parameters**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **1613.6.3 Automatic fire sprinkler systems**

Chief Rogers pointed out that this Oregon amendment has now been captured in the model code and can be eliminated as an Oregon amendment.

### **1613.7 Modification to ASCE 7-05**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

#### **1613.7.1 ASCE 7-05 Section 12.2.5.5**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

#### **1613.7.2 ASCE 7-05 Table 12.2-1**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

#### **1613.7.3 ASCE 7-05 Section 12.2.5.7**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

#### **1613.7.4 Clarification of component anchorage requirements**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

### **1613.7.5 Amendment to ASCE 7-05 Section 13.1.4, exception 5**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved code amendment proposal #OSSC 10-12, which addresses this section, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

### **1613.7.6 Amendment to ASCE 7-05 Section 13.5.6.2.2, Item c, “suspended ceiling” in Seismic Design Categories D through F**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted the committee approved a code amendment proposal that adjusted the requirement to 1,000 feet, so the existing Oregon amendment will be modified to align with that proposal.

### **1613.8 Earthquake recording instrumentation**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

#### **1613.8.1 Location**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

#### **1613.8.2 Maintenance**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

#### **1613.8.3 Records**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **Figure 1613.5(1) Maximum Considered Earthquake Ground Motion for Oregon State of 0.2 SEC Spectral Response Acceleration, Site Class B**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted that this figure is Oregon specific and is still needed.

### **Figure 1613.5 (2) Maximum Considered Earthquake Ground Motion for Oregon State of 1.0 SEC Spectral Response Acceleration, Site Class B**

Mr. Riemenschneider noted that this figure is Oregon specific and is still needed.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-16, with the exception of Figure 1609, which is tabled, and those sections that are covered in the model code.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **CHAPTER 17, STRUCTURAL TESTS AND SPECIAL INSPECTIONS**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained to the committee that it is necessary to retain most of the existing Oregon amendment because the national model code does not have a lot of changes. He briefly discussed the new model code changes before going on to review the existing Oregon amendment.

### **SECTION 1704, SPECIAL INSPECTIONS**

#### **1704.2.2 Fabricator approval**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **1704.3 Steel construction**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

## **SECTION 1705, STATEMENT OF SPECIAL INSPECTIONS**

### **1705.3 Seismic resistance**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

## **SECTION 1707, SPECIAL INSPECTION FOR SEISMIC RESISTANCE**

### **1707.1 Special inspections for seismic resistance**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

### **1707.8 Mechanical and electrical components**

Mr. Riemenschneider explained that model code does not capture the requirements in the existing Oregon amendment and the provisions are still needed.

**Motion** to approve existing Oregon amendment #EA 07-17.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

## **Editorial and non-substantive changes**

### **CHAPTER 17, STRUCTURAL TESTS AND SPECIAL INSPECTIONS and CHAPTER 18, SOILS AND FOUNDATIONS**

**Motion** to approve the editorial and non-substantive changes to Chapters 17 and 18.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

*Vice-chair Lampella adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.*

Note: *The below list is provided for the reader's reference and contains frequently used acronyms found in the meeting summary.*

#### ***Frequently Used Acronyms:***

AASHTO American Association of State Highway  
and Transportation Officials

ADAAG ADA Accessibility Guidelines

ANSI American National Standards Institute

ASCE American Society of Civil Engineers

ASTM American Society for Testing and Materials

BCD Building Codes Division

FHA Federal Housing Administration

IBC International Building Code

ICC International Code Council

IEBC International Existing Building Code

IRC International Residential Code

MSJC Masonry Standards Joint Committee

NFPA National Fire Protection Association

NWCMA Northwest Concrete and Masonry  
Association

OBOA Oregon Building Officials Association

OESC Oregon Electrical Specialty Code

OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Division

OSSC Oregon Structural Specialty Code

SEAO Structural Engineers Association of Oregon